

**Q1. Please state your name.**

**A1.** My name is Ted Teffner. I am the Chair of the Town of Stowe Selectboard. I have been a member of the Selectboard since 1991, and have served as Chair intermittently during that period.

**Q2. Where do you reside?**

**A2.** I reside at 4310 Mountain Road in the Town of Stowe. I have lived in the Town for most of the last fifty years.

**Q3. Have you served in any other capacity for the Town of Stowe?**

**A3.** Yes, I have. I served for approximately nine (9) years as a member of the Town of Stowe Zoning Board of Adjustment, including three (3) years as Chair. As a member of the Town's ZBA, I participated in the review of numerous applications for development approval, and routinely evaluated project effects on aesthetics and the character of the area. I do not, however, profess to be an expert in the application of the so-called Quechee Analysis, which I understand is one aspect of the aesthetic assessment conducted by the Public Service Board under §248 of Title 30.

**Q4. Please describe your professional background.**

**A4.** I am the Vice-President of Engineering at WCAX-TV (Mount Mansfield Television, Inc.) and have been employed in the engineering department for over forty (40) years. I am responsible for the management/supervision of the technical facilities of the station, including four news bureaus located around the region. In addition, in recent years, much of my work has been directed toward the development of facilities necessary to enable all of the stations in the Burlington/Plattsburgh market to transition to digital television.

**Q5. How are your responsibilities at WCAX relevant to the VELCO Lamoille County Project (LCP)?**

**A5.** As Chair of the Mt. Mansfield Colocation Technical Committee, I have worked extensively to devise tower and antenna solutions that meet all of the technical requirements of the various television and radio stations while simultaneously addressing the aesthetic and natural resource concerns of various interested parties/groups, including the Green Mountain Club and the Vermont Natural Resources Council.

**Q6. What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony?**

**A6.** First, let me state that I am testifying on behalf of the Town of Stowe Selectboard. The purpose of my testimony is to respond to line design and aesthetic mitigation recommendations that have been offered by David Raphael (d/b/a Landworks) on behalf of the Vermont Department of Public Service. Although the Selectboard agrees with many of Mr. Raphael's suggestions for line design and mitigation in the Town of Stowe, we suggest somewhat different (or more detailed) mitigation solutions in certain specific areas. These different solutions are the result of

various discussions that the Selectboard has had with affected landowners, the Stowe Electric Department, and VELCO.

**Q7. Are you familiar with the components of the LCP proposed for the Town of Stowe?**

**A7.** Yes, I am.

**Q8. Please describe the basis of your familiarity with the project.**

**A8.** Selectboard members have reviewed the LCP proposal, including the prefiled testimony of VELCO witnesses and the project plans. Board members participated in the Public Service Board's site visit along the LCP corridor. In addition, the Selectboard, together with interested landowners and personnel from VELCO and Stowe Electric Department, has conducted its own site visit to specific locations along the corridor in Stowe. Board members have also heard the concerns of affected landowners at numerous Selectboard meetings.

**Q9. Would you please describe how the Selectboard's mitigation suggestions differ from those of Mr. Raphael.**

**A10.** Yes, I will. In doing so, I will use the same mile marker references contained in Mr. Raphael's report, DPS-DR-1.

**Mile 6.8 to Mile 7.7**

This segment of the LCP corridor passes through the Black Bear Run development and in the vicinity of South Marshall Road. Mr. Raphael, in DPS-DR-1 at 25, states that "there is no question that this project will have the potential for an undue adverse impact along this stretch of the route." The Selectboard agrees that the potential for significant aesthetic impacts exists in this area, as a result of the project.

In DPS-DR-1, at 26, Mr. Raphael suggests, in Mitigation Recommendation #1, that VELCO employ the single pole configuration options proposed in George Smith's testimony for DPS "to *limit height* and visibility of the line and its structures." (Emphasis added)

The Selectboard agrees that a single pole configuration is appropriate in this area. Mr. Raphael's comments neglect to mention, however, anything about line design. The Selectboard believes that the single pole design would be visually enhanced by configuring the transmission lines so that there are three (3) 115 kV lines on one side of the pole and three (3) 34.5 kV lines on the other side of the pole.

Moreover, the Selectboard believes that Mr. Raphael's suggestion, at least in the Black Bear Run area, that pole heights be limited is inconsistent with the public good. Indeed, rather than limit pole heights through the Black Bear Run development, the Selectboard, having consulted with affected property owners, the Stowe Electric Department and VELCO, believes that, in this area, the proposed 115/34.5 kV line should be constructed

1 using a single pole, double circuit configuration, without the use of Hendrix (which is a  
2 concern because of its height/visual impact). The Selectboard understands and  
3 acknowledges that this configuration will result in larger, taller, concrete-imbedded poles.  
4 This is acceptable to the Town, however, since it raises the lines and insulators up and out  
5 of direct view. In addition, the higher poles will minimize the cutting that is required  
6 within the VELCO right-of-way.

7  
8 In his Mitigation Recommendation #3 (DPS-DR-1 at 26), Mr. Raphael states that  
9 “[m]inimal clearing and vegetative retention details must be provided.” Similarly, in his  
10 Mitigation Recommendation #7, Mr. Raphael calls for “[d]etailed plans for existing  
11 vegetation and what will be retained, as well as proposed new plantings.” Given his  
12 expertise in this field, the Selectboard believes that Mr. Raphael’s recommendations do  
13 not go far enough and are not specific enough. The Selectboard agrees that it is  
14 important for VELCO to develop design detail level plans. However, it believes that  
15 within the required 100-foot right of way, VELCO should only have the right to cut  
16 “danger” trees (i.e., trees that come within 12 feet of the lowest conductor, at maximum  
17 sag), and that all other vegetation, not within this 12-foot area, should remain. In  
18 addition, VELCO should plant slow growing species of softwoods and hedges, as  
19 necessary and appropriate, both within and outside of the right-of-way to  
20 maintain/recreate the visual buffer between the line and residences, and the “privacy”  
21 buffer between residences. Where VELCO proposes to cut danger trees outside of its  
22 right-of-way, the Selectboard believes that it should be required to provide reasonable  
23 advance notice to both landowners and the Town. The Selectboard encourages VELCO  
24 to negotiate directly with landowners regarding the size, type and location of mitigation  
25 plantings outside the right-of-way. The Selectboard is prepared to work as a facilitator  
26 for any such negotiations.

#### 27 28 **Mile 7.7 to 8.2** 29

30 In this area of the LCP corridor, the Selectboard generally agrees with the mitigation  
31 recommendations contained in DPS-DR-1, and believes that VELCO should be required  
32 to adhere to them. However, in his Mitigation Recommendation #1 (DPS-DR-1 at 27-  
33 28), Mr. Raphael again suggests the use of a “single pole configuration” without  
34 acknowledging that the use of H-frame structures may also be appropriate to keep pole  
35 heights as low as possible. The Selectboard believes that VELCO should use the lowest  
36 possible poles north of South Marshall Road and across Nichol’s Field, possibly  
37 transitioning to H-frame structures, to avoid sky-lighting in this area.

#### 38 39 **Mile 8.2 to 9.4** 40

41 In this section of the LCP corridor, Mr. Raphael acknowledges the potential visual impact  
42 of the project in the vicinity of Cady Hill Road, but he suggests, by omission, that the  
43 project will have no visual impact when viewed from Shaw Hill Road and that mitigation  
44 is not necessary in that area (i.e., between approximately Mile Marker 8.2 and 8.5). The  
45 Selectboard disagrees. The Selectboard believes that appropriate mitigation suggestions

1 for this area should include a requirement that VELCO work with landowners to relocate  
2 the right-of-way to the east (down the bank, toward the River Road), to the extent  
3 feasible, to reduce the visual impact of the project in this area. The Selectboard does  
4 agree with Mr. Raphael's Mitigation Recommendation #1 (DPS-DR-1 at 28) that  
5 VELCO should employ "the lowest height poles configuration options" to limit visibility  
6 in the vicinity of Cady Hill Road, but believes that this recommendation is equally  
7 applicable in the Shaw Hill Road/River Road area.  
8

9 **Q11. Do you have any further comments regarding Mr. Raphael's mitigation**  
10 **recommendations?**

11 **A11.** Yes. As noted above, the Selectboard generally concurs with the  
12 recommendations contained in DPS-DR-1 that pertain to the Town of Stowe. The  
13 Selectboard believes that in all other locations in the Town, except as otherwise  
14 specified herein, the Public Service Board should require VELCO to adhere to the  
15 mitigation recommendations contained in the Raphael Report. In particular, the  
16 Selectboard generally supports the mitigation recommendations for the Town that  
17 are set forth on pages 25 through 30 of DPS-DR-1, and asks that the PSB adopt  
18 them, as appropriate.  
19

20 **Q12. Do the foregoing suggestions/comments regarding the LCP indicate that the**  
21 **Selectboard has reservations about the need for the proposed line or**  
22 **otherwise objects to it?**

23 **A12.** No, absolutely not. The Selectboard, like almost every party in this proceeding,  
24 believes that this line is necessary to ensure reliable power to the Lamoille County  
25 area. In fact, during all of the meetings and discussions that the Selectboard has  
26 had regarding this project and its impact on Stowe, I cannot recall anyone ever  
27 suggesting that the line is not needed. Moreover, the Selectboard had no general  
28 objection to the project. Indeed, it was proposed, in part, by the Town's own  
29 Electric Department, and the Selectboard supports the proposal as an essentially  
30 sound and reasonable infrastructure improvement.  
31

32 **Q13. Does that conclude your testimony?**

33 **A13.** Yes, it does.